UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/877,513	06/08/2001	Michael R. Lessard	3330/60	1671

29858   7590   05/02/2005

BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP
900 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER
PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/877,513	LESSARD, MICHAEL R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 February 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to remarks and amendments filed on February 27,

2005. No claims were amended or cancelled. No new claims were added. Claims 1 – 16

are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed on February 27, 2005, have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

3.   Remarks contain an error with respect to Claim numbers that are discussed. For

example, with respect to Claim 16, Claim 28 is independent claim wherein, the remarks

disclose Claim 16 as dependent on Claim 15. Examiner reads that as Claim 16 as

independent.

4.   Regarding independent Claims 1, 15 and 16, applicant argued that the cited prior

art Shklar et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,253,239) does not disclose "virtualizing external

data as virtual native data, including determining an external data set or table to be

virtualized as a plurality of virtual native documents, the virtual native documents being

native to a host operating environment, and allowing use of the external data through

the host operating environment". These arguments are not persuasive.

Shklar discloses virtualizing external data as virtual native data including

determining an external data set or table to be virtualized as a plurality of virtual native

documents" (Column 6 line 35 – Column 8 line 9), wherein Shklar teaches virtualizing

stored data (external data) as virtual native data, the virtual native documents being

native to the host operating environment (retrieved and processed in the native format

according to the metadata) and determining an external data set or table to be

virtualized as a plurality of virtual native documents (data stored and the type

specification is entered in a type library which can later be processed without creating

another type specification for that format (native data), "the virtual native documents

being native to a host operating environment", (Column 7 lines 35 – Column 8 line 9),

wherein Shklar teaches that the retrieved data is processed in the native format, and

"allowing use of the external data through the host operating environment", (Column 6

line 35 – Column 8 line 17), wherein Shklar teaches that the server retrieves the

external data and processed using the metadata.

Furthermore, Shklar discloses encapsulating the stored data, mapping data

according to their association in a virtual container by indexing recursively and also that

the stored data (external data) may be displayed in different formats without affecting

the data itself (Column 5 line 19 – Column 6 line 9).

5.   Therefore, the examiner respectfully asserts that the cited prior art does teach or

suggest the subject matter "virtualizing external data as virtual native data, including

determining an external data set or table to be virtualized as a plurality of virtual native

documents, the virtual native documents being native to a host operating environment,

and allowing use of the external data through the host operating environment", broadly

recited in the amended independent claims 1, 5, 15 and 16. The dependent claims 2 – 4

and 6 – 14 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on the dependent claims

and by other reason set forth in this office action. Accordingly, the rejection for the

pending claims 1 – 16 is respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shklar

et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,253,239).

Regarding Claim 1, Shklar teaches and describes a method for virtualizing

external data as virtual native data, the external data being from a source that is

external to a host operating environment, and the virtual native data being native to the

host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column

12 line 46), the method comprising:

determining an external data set to be virtualized as a plurality of virtual native

documents, the plurality of virtual native documents being native to the host operating

environment (Column 7 line 35 – Column 8 line 9);

determining mapping data to associate each of a first set of data groups from the

external data set with fields of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 4 line 52

– Column 5 line 19; Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 – 37);

utilizing the mapping data, determining wrapping data associated with each of a

second set of data groups from the external data set, the wrapping data being for

specifying characteristics of external data from the external data set as the fields of the

plurality of virtual native documents (Column 6 line 35 – Column 7 line 34 and Column 8

line 10 – Column 9 line 8); and

utilizing the wrapping data, allowing use of the external data through the host

operating environment (Column 6 line 35 – Column 8 line 17).

Regarding Claim 5, Shklar teaches and describes a method for virtualizing

external data as virtual native data, the external data being from a source that is

external to a host operating environment, and the virtual native data being native to the

host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column

12 line 46), the method comprising:

determining an external data table having a plurality of rows to be virtualized as a

plurality of virtual native documents, the plurality of virtual native documents being

native to the host operating environment (Column 7 line 35 – Column 8 line 9 and

Column 11 lines 1 – 12);

determining mapping data to associate columns from the external data table with

fields of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 4 line 52 – Column 5 line 19;

Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 – 37);

utilizing the mapping data, determining wrapping data associated with each of a

plurality of rows from the external data table, the wrapping data being for specifying

characteristics of each row of external data from the external data table as a virtual

native document of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 6 line 35 – Column

7 line 34 and Column 8 line 10 – Column 9 line 8); and

utilizing the wrapping data, allowing use of the external data through the host

operating environment (Column 6 line 35 – Column 8 line 17).

Regarding Claim 15, Shklar teaches and describes a computer usable medium

storing program code which, when executed on a computerized device, causes the

computerized device to execute a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native

data, the external data being from a source that is external to a host operating

environment, and the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment

(Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), the method

comprising:

determining an external data set to be virtualized as a plurality of virtual native

documents, the plurality of virtual native documents being native to the host operating

environment (Column 7 line 35 – Column 8 line 9);

determining mapping data to associate each of a first set of data groups from the

external data set with a field of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 4 line

52 – Column 5 line 19; Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 –

37);

utilizing the mapping data, determining wrapping data associated with each of a

second set of data groups from the external data set, the mapping data being for

specifying characteristics of external data from the external data set as the fields of the

plurality of virtual native documents (Column 6 line 35 – Column 7 line 34 and Column 8

line 10 – Column 9 line 8); and

utilizing the wrapping data, allowing use of the external data through the host

operating environment (Column 6 line 35 – Column 8 line 17).

Regarding Claim 16, Shklar teaches and describes a computer usable medium

storing program code which, when executed on a computerized device, causes the

computerized device to execute a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native

data, the external data being from a source that is external to a host operating

environment, and the virtual native data being native to the host operating

environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), the

method comprising:

determining an external data table to be virtualized as a plurality of virtual native

documents, the plurality of virtual native documents being native to the host operating

environment (Column 7 line 35 – Column 8 line 9 and Column 11 lines 1 – 12);

determining mapping data to associate columns from the external data table with

fields of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 4 line 52 – Column 5 line 19;

Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 – 37);

utilizing the mapping data, determining mapping data associated with rows from

the external data table, the wrapping data being for specifying characteristics of external

data from the external data table as the fields of the plurality of virtual native documents

(Column 6 line 35 – Column 7 line 34 and Column 8 line 10 – Column 9 line 8); and

utilizing the wrapping data, allowing use of the external data through the host

operating environment (Column 6 line 35 – Column 8 line 17).

Claim 2 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 1. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein determining an external

data set comprises determining an external data table (Column 7 line 35 – Column 8

line 9 and Column 11 lines 1 – 12).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein determining wrapping data comprises determining a plurality of columns to be appended to the external data table for specifying characteristics of the plurality of rows as the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 8 line 42 – 48 and Column 10 lines 15 – 67).

Claim 7 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9; Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein determining wrapping data comprises determining wrapping data to associate each of a first plurality of columns from the external data table with each of a plurality of fields of the plurality of virtual native documents (Column 6 lines 19 – 57 and Column 11 lines 1 – 54).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein each of the plurality of

documents is of a same type (Column 4 line 52 – Column 5 line 34).

Claim 9 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein allowing use of the

external data through the host operating environment does not require nonvolatile

storage of the wrapping data as native data to the host operating environment (Column

12 lines 5 – 24).

Claim 10 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein allowing use of the

external data comprises allowing use of the external data as a first class participant in

the host operating environment (Column 10 line 4 – Column 12 line 13).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), comprising, if a set of external

data from the external data table is changed through the host operating environment:

appropriately updating the set of external data in the external data table (Column

10 line 46 – Column 11 line 54); and

appropriately updating a first set of wrapping data associated with the updated

set of external data, if any updating of the first set of wrapping data is appropriate

(Column 8 lines 10 – 48 and Column 10 line 46 – Column 11 line 54).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), comprising, if a set of external

data from the external data table is updated externally from the host operating

environment:

appropriately updating a set of wrapping data associated with the updated set of

external data, if any updating of the set of wrapping data is appropriate (Column 8 lines

10 – 48 and Column 10 line 46 – Column 11 line 54).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), comprising, if a set of external

data associated with the external data table is added through the host operating

environment, adding the set of external data to the external data table (Column 10 line

46 – Column 11 line 54);

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 5. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), if a set of external data

associated with the external data table is added externally from the host operating

environment:

if appropriate, determining mapping data associated with the set of external data

(Column 4 line 52 – Column 5 line 19; Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and

Column 11 lines 1 – 37); and

storing the wrapping data in the external data table (Column 8 lines 3 – 61 and

Column 11 lines 38 – 54).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 2. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein determining mapping

data to associate each of a first set of data groups comprises determining mapping data

to associate each of a first set of columns (Column 4 line 52 – Column 5 line 19;

Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 – 37).

Claim 4 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 3. Furthermore, Shklar

teaches and describes a method for virtualizing external data as virtual native data, the

external data being from a source that is external to a host operating environment, and

the virtual native data being native to the host operating environment (Fig. 1, 2, 7 – 9;

Summary and Column 4 line 15 – Column 12 line 46), wherein determining wrapping

data associated with each of a second set of data groups comprises determining

wrapping data associated with each of a second set of rows (Column 4 line 52 –

Column 5 line 19; Column 9 line 62 – Column 10 line 14 and Column 11 lines 1 – 37).

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-

272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m.. If attempts

to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz

Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to

the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose

telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more

information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy

April 25, 2005.

AVAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100